	3:23-cv-05886-MGL Date Filed 11/16/23	Entry Number 1 Page 1 of 5
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA DIVISION	
3	LAKEYSHA TENILLE HENRY, as an	Case No.: 3:23-cv-05886-MGL
4	individual,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES and
5	Plaintiff(s),	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
6	VS.	
7	DUGDIEGG DIFODMATION CDOUD DIG	
8	BUSINESS INFORMATION GROUP, INC., a Foreign Corporation registered to do	
9	business in the State of Pennsylvania; and DOES 1-10 inclusive,	
10	Defendant(s).	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	Plaintiff LAKEYSHA TENILLE HENRY (hereafter "Plaintiff") files her	
17	Complaint for Damages and Demand for a Jury Trial against Defendants BUSINESS	
18	INFORMATION GROUP, INC., and DOES 1-10 inclusive (hereinafter collectively as	
19	"Defendants"), and alleges as follows:	
20	NATURE OF THE ACTION	
21	1. Defendant is an employment scre	ening company that furnishes employment
22	screening reports to prospective employers. Its reports include information related to an	
23	applicant's criminal history.	
24	2. On or about December 2021,	Plaintiff was conditionally hired by her

- 2. On or about December 2021, Plaintiff was conditionally hired by her prospective employer Ruthlie Israel Insurance Agency, LLC.
- 3. In connection with Plaintiff's employment application, Ruthlie Israel procured a background screening report on Plaintiff from Defendant.

2728

25

26

- 4. On or about December 22, 2021, Defendant furnished an employment background check report to Plaintiff's prospective employer.
 - 5. Defendant disclosed inaccurate criminal history.
- 6. Specifically, Defendant disclosed records that had been pardoned on December 4, 2019 without disclosing the fact of the pardon.
- 7. Any cursory review of records from the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services would have alerted Defendant that the disclosed records had been pardoned.
- 8. Under the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA" 15 USC §1681 et seq.) §1681(e)(b), Defendant was required to use reasonable procedures to ensure the *maximum* possible accuracy of the information reported. Disclosing pardoned records is a clear violation of this statute.
- 9. Defendant did not have defined processes to verify the accuracy of the public records information provided.
- 10. Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer actual damages and emotional distress as a result of the denial of employment.
- 11. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks recovery for her actual damages, including denial of employment, emotional distress, and damage to her reputation. Moreover, Plaintiff seeks statutory penalties, punitive damages, as well as attorney's fees and costs.

THE PARTIES

- 12. Plaintiff is an individual and resident of the County of Richland, Columbia, South Carolina.
- 13. Defendant is an investigative consumer reporting agency within the meaning of the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA" 15 U.S. Code §1681 *et seq.*) 15 U.S. Code §1681(a)(f) and it is a routine seller of investigative consumer reports within the meaning of 15 U.S. Code §1681e.

- 14. Plaintiff is ignorant of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues those Defendants by such capacities when such information is ascertained through discovery.
- 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the DOES 1-10 Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and that Plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by such occurrences.
- 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all times herein mentioned, Defendants DOES 1-10, were principals or agents of each other and of the named Defendants and in doing the things alleged in this complaint, were acting in the scope of such agency and with the permission and consent of Defendants.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(15 USC §1681(e)(b) and DOES 1-10)

- 17. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of each and every paragraph above.
- 18. Defendant willfully and/or recklessly violated the above-referenced sections of the FCRA by disclosing erroneous information.
- 19. Defendant's conduct was willful and/or reckless because it knew that disclosing pardoned records is insufficient to assure maximum possible accuracy of the criminal history information reported.
- 20. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendant failed to sufficiently conduct audits, reviews, or quality control of the information it reported.
 - 21. Alternatively, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's violations were negligent.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(15 USC §1681k(a)(2) and DOES 1-10)

22. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of each and every paragraph above.